

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing remarks. Claims 1-35 are pending, with claims 1, 13, 20, and 33 being independent. Claim 20 is amended and new claims 33-35 are added. No new matter is added.

Zaenen Rejection

Claims 1-5, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,642,522 to Zaenen et al., referenced hereinafter as Zaenen. This rejection is traversed based on the following comments, which first address claim 1 and its dependents, and then address claims 13 and 20 and their dependents.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for providing a computer user with an accessible electronic dictionary system. A data request action for a word appearing in an electronic document is received. A definition of the word and information regarding context of the word derived from within the electronic document in which the word appears is accessed. Both the definition of the word and the context information for the word are stored, and access to the definition and the context information is enabled.

As indicated by the title, Zaenen is directed to an electronic dictionary that uses contextual information to disambiguate among multiple definitions.¹ In particular, Zaenen is directed to using a multiple word combination in order to identify a meaning for a word.² As such, Zaenen relates to *word analysis*; Zaenen does not relate to *storage of contextual information*, nor does it relate to presentation of *previously-generated* contextual information identified in the course of executing a data request action.

Zaenen does not disclose “storing the definition of the word along with context information for the word, as recited by claim 1. Notably, in addressing this feature of claim 1, page 3 of the Office Action identifies these portions of Zaenen: col. 2, lines 54-57 and col. 8

¹ CONTEXT-SENSITIVE METHOD OF FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT A WORD IN AN ELECTRONIC DICTIONARY

² See Fig. 3.

lines 10-13, and col. 1, lines 40-41. The cited portions are reproduced below for convenience, and, as shown, none of the cited portions disclose the claimed limitation.

In the case of a dictionary the user is presented with whatever information the dictionary contains for the selected word, normally a number of definitions of the selected word. [Col. 2, lines 55-57].

The disambiguation procedure is based largely on the parts of speech associated with the words, and yields a set of possible contexts of the selected word, differentiated by probability. [Col. 8, lines 10-13].

In brief, the present invention maps the selected word from its inflected form (sometimes referred to as surface form) to a set of information including its citation form (sometimes referred to as dictionary form or lexical form), analyzes the selected word in the context of neighboring and surrounding words to resolve ambiguities, and displays the information that is determined to be the most likely to be relevant. The user is free to request additional information, in which case either the next most relevant information or all information about the selected word is provided. The dictionary preferably has information about multi-word combinations that include the selected word, and the context determination typically entails checking whether the selected word is part of a predefined multi-word combination. [Col. 1, lines 35-50 (the entire paragraph that includes the cited portion of Col. 1, lines 40-41)].

In particular, none of the cited portions disclose “storing the definition of the word along with context information for the word.”

Because Zaenen fails to disclose or suggest storing the definition of the word along with context information for the word, as recited by claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1, and claims 2-12, depending therefrom.

Claims 13 and 20 recite limitations that are similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claim 13 is directed to an electronic dictionary that includes “context information for at least one of the words based on information regarding context of the word from within the electronic document ... [that is distinct from the electronic dictionary].” Claim 20 has been amended and recites use of the claimed contextual dictionary. As discussed above, Zaenen does not provide for storing the definition of the word along with context information for the word. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 13 and 20 and claims 14-19, and 21-32, which depend from independent claims 13 and 20, respectively.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicant : Carl Bruecken
Serial No. : 09/964,453
Filed : September 28, 2001
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-202001


Moreover, new claims 33-35 recite additional features believed to distinguish the art of record, including Zaenen.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

Enclosed is a \$140 check for excess claim fees and a \$420 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/2/2004



W. Karl Renner
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40208083.doc